



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/785,204	02/20/2001	Mari Saito	203391US6	3961
22850	7590	07/17/2009		
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314				
EXAMINER				
PULLIAM, CHRISTYANN R				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2165				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/17/2009		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com

oblonpat@oblon.com

jgardner@oblon.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/785,204

Applicant(s)

SAITO ET AL.

Examiner

Christyann RF Pulliam

Art Unit

2165

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 January 2009 and 12 March 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/C)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Prosecution Application

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submissions filed on January 12, 2009 and March 12, 2009 have been entered.
2. A decision on appeal affirming the examiner in part and adding new rejections was issued by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences and mailed on June 20, 2008.
3. Claims 1-20 are pending. Claims 1-5 and 7-20 are currently amended. Claim 6 is original.

Claim Objections

4. Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: typographical error (missing word). The claim states "an acquisition device configured to said associated information". There appears to be a word missing between "to" and "said". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-4, 17 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shaffer et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,094,681) (hereinafter Shaffer), and in view of Nye, U.S. Patent No. 6,341,279 (hereinafter Nye).

As to Claim 1, Shaffer teaches an information processing apparatus displaying associated information corresponding to the occurrence a present event, comprising:

an acquisition device configured to said associated information using existing information corresponding to a past event (See e.g. Shaffer column 2, lines 7-23);

an event occurrence detection device configured to detect information corresponding to the occurrence of said present event (See e.g. Shaffer column 2, lines 24-37);

a search device configured to search said existing information corresponding to a past event having similarity to information corresponding to the present event detected by the event occurrence detection device (See e.g. Shaffer column 2, lines 38-59); and

a display control device configured to control the display of said associated information corresponding the occurrence of a present event that is related to the existing information corresponding to a past event that is retrieved by said search device (See e.g. Shaffer column 2, lines 40-67, and column 3, lines 1-11).

Shaffer teaches event notification when an event is detected. Shaffer also teaches updating events, like pushing updated stock prices. These updates include past and present related events since each update to information about "stock X" is related. However, Nye more clearly teaches present and past events being related (See e.g. Nye – Figures 4 and 8, col. 5, line 33- col. 6, line 8, col. 8, lines 8-60, col. 11, lines 1-65, col. 12, lines 4-17).

Shaffer and Nye are from the analogous art of event management. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made having the teachings of Shaffer and Nye to have combined Shaffer and Nye. The motivation to combine Shaffer and Nye is to expand the event relationships of Shaffer. Nye adds more storage, analysis and tracking of events to the system of Shaffer. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine Shaffer and Nye.

As to Claim 2, Shaffer as modified by Nye teaches parent Claim 1. Shaffer also teaches wherein said event occurrence detection device detects sending, receiving, or editing of an electronic mail as said event (See e.g. Shaffer column 3, lines 9-11, and column 5, lines 34-59, and Abstract - e-mail).

As to Claim 17, Shaffer as modified by Nye teaches parent Claim 1. Shaffer also teaches comprising:

a grouping device configured to group said existing information into a group of existing information based upon attribute information of said existing information (See e.g. Shaffer column 3, lines 48-64, also see Shaffer column 4, lines 11-20),

wherein said acquisition device acquires the associated information related to said group of existing information made by said grouping device as said existing information (See e.g. Shaffer column 8, lines 26-30, also see Shaffer column 8, lines 56-67, and Shaffer column 9, lines 28),

said search device searches for said group of existing information as said existing information having similarity to information corresponding to the present event detected by the event occurrence detection device (See e.g. Shaffer column 3, lines 48-64), and

the display control device controls displaying of said associated information related to said group of existing information as said existing information retrieved by said search device (See e.g. Shaffer column 2, lines 60-67, and Shaffer column 3, lines 1-11). Nye also teaches grouping events and related information (See e.g. Nye – Figures 4 and 8, col. 5, line 33- col. 6, line 8, col. 8, lines 8-60, col. 11, lines 1-65, col. 12, lines 4-17).

As to Claim 19, Shaffer as modified by Nye teaches parent Claim 1. Shaffer also teaches wherein said existing information corresponding to said past event is an existing text file and said information corresponding to said present event detected by the event occurrence detection device is a text file (See e.g. Shaffer column 3, lines 48-64, column 4, lines 11-20), further comprising,

a selection device for selecting an important word from among words contained in said existing text file (See e.g. Shaffer column 3, lines 48-64, column 4, lines 11-20), wherein the acquisition device acquires said associated information by using said important word selected by said selection device as said existing information (See e.g. Shaffer column 5, lines 42-65, wherein "important word" reads on "keyword").

Nye also teaches grouping events and related information (See e.g. Nye – Figures 3-4 and 6-8, col. 5, line 33- col. 6, line 8, col. 8, lines 8-60, col. 11, lines 1-65, col. 12, lines 4-17; col. 1, lines 45-63).

As to claim 3, Shaffer as modified by Nye teaches parent Claims 1 and 19. Shaffer also teaches wherein said acquisition device acquires a title and a URL of a Web page containing said important word as the associated information (See e.g. Shaffer column 6, lines 35-59, and column 6, lines 13-22).

As to claim 4, Shaffer as modified by Nye teaches parent Claims 1 and 19. Shaffer also teaches wherein said acquisition device acquires, in a predetermined timed relation, said associated information related to said important word selected by said

selection device (See e.g. Shaffer column 7, lines 41-67, wherein "timed relation" reads on "scheduling reminders", and abstract).

7. Claims 9-11 and 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shaffer et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,094,681) (hereinafter Shaffer), and in view of Kirsch et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,070,158 (hereinafter Kirsch).

As to Claim 9, Shaffer teaches: information processing apparatus for displaying a character on a display device and for displaying associated information related to a text file processed by a predetermined application program, comprising:

a processing detection device configured to detect, as an event, predetermined processing of said predetermined application program (See e.g. Shaffer column 4, lines 10-5, column 6, lines 56-59);

a keyword detection device configured to detect a keyword from said text file processed by said predetermined application program corresponding to said event detected by said processing detection device (See e.g. Shaffer column 3, lines 48-64, column 4, lines 11-20);

...

a search device configured to search a database for said associated information by searching a database for a previous processed existing file corresponding to said keyword detected by said keyword detection device (See e.g. Shaffer column 2, lines 38-59);

an input device configured to input a command (See e.g. Shaffer column 10, lines 31-33);

a command processing device configured to execute, in response to said command inputted by said input device, processing on said associated information retrieved by said search device (See e.g. Shaffer column 10, lines 31-40); and

a display control device configured to display, in response to said event detected by said processing detection device, said character onto said display device and changing a manner of displaying said character in response to said command inputted by said input device (See e.g. Shaffer column 2, lines 60-67, and Shaffer column 3, lines 1-11).

Shaffer teaches key word searches. Shaffer does not expressly teach text file processing for computing weights for said important word based on use of occurrence frequency in the text file and obtaining associated information for an important word having a higher weight than a predetermined threshold. However, Kirsch teaches text file processing for computing weights for said important word based on use of occurrence frequency in the text file and obtaining associated information for an important word having a higher weight than a predetermined threshold (See e.g. Kirsch - col. 10, lines 16-45 - frequency, threshold, contextual significance and col. 17, line 25- col. 18, line 45 – score based on frequency, terms counts, groups, subgroups, weights).

Shaffer and Kirsch are from the analogous art of search processing. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made having the teachings of Shaffer and Kirsch to have combined Shaffer and Kirsch. The

motivation to combine Shaffer and Kirsch is expand the elements analyzed in a document and used to score the relevance of said document. Due to the overlapping search subject matter, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine Shaffer and Kirsch.

As to Claim 10, Shaffer as modified by Kirsch teaches parent Claim 9. Shaffer also teaches said display control device also displays text information as a script of said character (See e.g. Shaffer column 7, lines 19-37).

As to Claim 11, Shaffer as modified by Kirsch teaches parent Claims 9 and 10. Shaffer also teaches comprising an output device configured to output a voice signal corresponding to said text information displayed by said display control device (See e.g. Shaffer column 7, lines 19-37).

As to Claim 14, Shaffer as modified by Kirsch teaches parent Claim 9. Shaffer also teaches wherein said associated information is a URL of a Web page and said command processing device starts a WWW browser so as to access said URL of said Web page as said associated information in response to an access command inputted by said input device (See e.g. Shaffer column 6, lines 13-59).

As to Claims 15, and 16, Shaffer teaches an information processing method, and a program storage medium storing a computer-readable program for an information

processing apparatus for displaying a character on a display device and for displaying associated information related to a text file processed by a predetermined application program (See e.g. Shaffer column 6, lines 13-59), comprising the steps of:

detecting, as an event, predetermined processing of said predetermined application program (See e.g. Shaffer column 4, lines 10-5, also see Shaffer column 6, lines 56-59);

detecting a keyword from said text file processed by said predetermined application program corresponding to said event detected in the processing detecting step (See e.g. Shaffer column 3, lines 48-64, also see Shaffer column 4, lines 11-20);

... searching for said associated information by searching for a previously processed existing file corresponding to said keyword detected in the keyword detecting step (See e.g. Shaffer column 2, lines 38-59);

executing, in response to a command inputted, processing on said associated information retrieved in the searching step (See e.g. Shaffer column 10, lines 31-40);
and

displaying, in response to said event detected in the processing of said detecting step, said character onto said display device and changing a manner of displaying said character in response to said command inputted in the inputting step (See e.g. Shaffer column 2, lines 60-67, and Shaffer column 3, lines 1-11).

Shaffer teaches key word searches. Shaffer does not expressly teaches text file processing for computing weights for said important word based on use of occurrence frequency in the text file and obtaining associated information for an important word

having a higher weight than a predetermined threshold. However, Kirsch teaches text file processing for computing weights for said important word based on use of occurrence frequency in the text file and obtaining associated information for an important word having a higher weight than a predetermined threshold (See e.g. Kirsch - col. 10, lines 16-45 - frequency, threshold, contextual significance and col. 17, line 25- col. 18, line 45 – score based on frequency, terms counts, groups, subgroups, weights).

Shaffer and Kirsch are from the analogous art of search processing. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made having the teachings of Shaffer and Kirsch to have combined Shaffer and Kirsch. The motivation to combine Shaffer and Kirsch is expand the elements analyzed in a document and used to score the relevance of said document. Due to the overlapping search subject matter, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine Shaffer and Kirsch.

8. Claims 7-8, 12-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shaffer in view of Conley, Jr. et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,434,745 B1) and in further view of Kirsch.

As to Claims 7 and 8, Shaffer teaches an information processing method for an information processing apparatus, and program storage medium storing a computer-readable program for detecting a keyword from a text file corresponding to an event that has taken place and displaying associated information corresponding to said keyword

(See e.g. Shaffer column 3, lines 48-64, also see Shaffer column 4, lines 11-20),
comprising the steps of:

selecting an important word from among words contained in said existing text file
(See e.g. Shaffer column 3, lines 48-64, column 4, lines 11-20);

detecting the occurrence of said event (See e.g. Shaffer column 2, lines 24-37);
detecting a keyword from said text file corresponding to said event detected in
the event occurrence detecting step (See e.g. Shaffer column 3, lines 48-64);

searching said database constructed in the database constructing step for said
associated information corresponding to said keyword detected in the keyword
detecting step (See e.g. Shaffer column 2, lines 38-59); and

controlling displaying of said associated information retrieved in the searching
step (See e.g. Shaffer column 2, lines 60-67, and Shaffer column 3, lines 1-11).

Shaffer does not teach extracting attribute information from an existing text file;
acquiring said associated information related to said important word selected in
the selecting step;

constructing a database by use of at least one of said attribute information
extracted in the extraction step and said associated information acquired in the
acquiring step.

However, Conley, Jr. et al. teaches:
extracting attribute information from an existing text file (See e.g. Conley, Jr. et al.
column 1, lines 40-46, prior art, also see Conley, Jr. et al. column 7, lines 5-53, and see
Conley, Jr. et al. column 8, lines 38-62);

acquiring said associated information related to said important word selected in the selecting step (See e.g. Conley, Jr. et al. column 1, lines 40-46, prior art, also see Conley, Jr. et al. column 7, lines 5-53, and see Conley, Jr. et al. column 8, lines 38-62);

constructing a database by use of at least one of said attribute information extracted in the extraction step and said associated information acquired in the acquiring step.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Shaffer to include extracting attribute information from an existing text file; acquiring said associated information related to said important word selected in the selecting step; constructing a database by use of at least one of said attribute information extracted in the extraction step and said associated information acquired in the acquiring step. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Shaffer by the teaching of Conley, Jr. et al. to include extracting attribute information from an existing text file; acquiring said associated information related to said important word selected in the selecting step; constructing a database by use of at least one of said attribute information extracted in the extraction step and said associated information acquired in the acquiring step because it provides seamless and easy system of gathering marketing information based on the end user's browser's use.

Shaffer teaches key word searches. Shaffer does not expressly teaches text file processing for computing weights for said important word based on use of occurrence frequency in the text file and obtaining associated information for an important word

having a higher weight than a predetermined threshold. However, Kirsch teaches analyzing said extracted attribute information (See e.g. Kirsch – col. 13, line 58- col. 16, line 30 and col. 17, line 25- col. 18, line 45) and text file processing for computing weights for said important word based on use of occurrence frequency in the text file and obtaining associated information for an important word having a higher weight than a predetermined threshold (See e.g. Kirsch - col. 10, lines 16-45 - frequency, threshold, contextual significance and col. 17, line 25- col. 18, line 45 – score based on frequency, terms counts, groups, subgroups, weights).

Shaffer and Kirsch are from the analogous art of search processing. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made having the teachings of Shaffer and Kirsch to have combined Shaffer and Kirsch. The motivation to combine Shaffer and Kirsch is expand the elements analyzed in a document and used to score the relevance of said document. Due to the overlapping search subject matter, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine Shaffer and Kirsch.

As to claim 12, Shaffer as modified by Kirsch above teaches parent Claim 9. Shaffer does not teach wherein said command processing device displays, on said display device, said associated information retrieved by said search device in an object form with respect to at least one of movement, storage, and deletion, in response to a display command inputted by said input device.

Conley, Jr. et al. teaches wherein said command processing device displays, on said display device, said associated information retrieved by said search device in an object form with respect to at least one of movement, storage, and deletion, in response to a display command inputted by said input device (See e.g. Conley, Jr. et al. column 8, lines 5-40).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Shaffer to include wherein said command processing displays, on said display device, said associated information retrieved by said search means in an object form with respect to at least one of movement, storage, and deletion, in response to a display command inputted by said input device. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Shaffer by the teaching of Conley, Jr. et al. to include wherein said command processing displays, on said display device, said associated information retrieved by said search means in an object form with respect to at least one of movement, storage, and deletion, in response to a display command inputted by said input device because it provides accurate accounting and classification of database records and it also provides for efficient method for managing user related information.

As to Claim 13, Shaffer as modified by Conley, Jr. and Kirsch teaches parent Claims 9 and 12. Conley, Jr. also teaches wherein said command processing device stores said associated information in response to a storage command inputted by said input device and displays a list of the stored associated information onto said display

device (See e.g. Conley, Jr. et al. column 1, lines 40-46, prior art, also see Conley, Jr. et al. column 7, lines 5-53, and see Conley, Jr. et al. column 8, lines 38-62).

9. Claims 20 and 5-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shaffer in view of Nye and in further view of Conley, Jr.

As to claim 20, Shaffer as modified by Nye teaches parent Claim 1. Shaffer does not teach comprising:

extraction mean for extracting attribute information from the existing information;
database construction means for constructing a database by use of at least one of said attribute information extracted by said extraction means and said associated information acquired by said acquisition means.

Conley, Jr. et al. teaches comprising:

extraction mean for extracting attribute information from the existing information
(See e.g. Conley, Jr. et al. column 1, lines 40-46, prior art, also see Conley, Jr. et al. column 7, lines 5-53, and see Conley, Jr. et al. column 8, lines 38-62);

database construction means for constructing a database by use of at least one of said attribute information extracted by said extraction means and said associated information acquired by said acquisition means (See e.g. Conley, Jr. et al. column 2, lines 50-67).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Shaffer to include extraction device for

extracting attribute information from the existing information; database construction means for constructing a database by use of at least one of said attribute information extracted by said extraction device and said associated information acquired by said acquisition device. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Shaffer by the teaching of Conley, Jr. et al. to include extraction device for extracting attribute information from the existing information; database construction device for constructing a database by use of at least one of said attribute information extracted by said extraction device and said associated information acquired by said acquisition device because it provides accurate accounting and classification of database records and it also provides for efficient method for managing user related information.

As to claim 5, Shaffer as modified by Nye and Conley, Jr. teaches parent Claims 1 and 20. Shaffer also teaches further comprising:

if an update condition is satisfied, update mean for updating said database constructed by said database construction device (See e.g. Shaffer column 4, lines 11-67, wherein "database" reads on "local memory").

As to claim 6, Shaffer as modified by Nye and Conley, Jr. teaches parent Claims 1, 20 and 5. Shaffer also teaches wherein said update condition can be set by a user (See e.g. Shaffer column 4, lines 11-67).

10. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shaffer in view of Nye and in further view of CAPPI (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0038308 A1).

As to claim 18, Shaffer as modified by Nye teaches parent Claims 1 and 17. Shaffer does not teach comprising:

a weight calculation device configured to calculate the weight of keywords contained in each said group of existing information,

a selection device configured to select for selecting an important word among said key words based upon said weight of key words,

wherein said acquisition device acquires said associated information related to said group of existing information using said important word selected by said selection device.

CAPPI teaches comprising:

a weight calculation device configured to calculate the for calculating weight of keywords contained in each said group of existing information (See e.g. CAPPI page 9, paragraphs 0103-0106),

a selection device configured to select for selecting an important word among said key words based upon said weight of key words (See e.g. CAPPI page 9, paragraphs 0108-0111),

wherein said acquisition device acquires said associated information related to said group of existing information using said important word selected by said selection device (See e.g. CAPPI page 14, paragraphs 0157-0163).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Shaffer to include weight calculation means for calculating weight of keywords contained in each said group of existing information, selection means for selecting an important word among said key words based upon said weight of key words, wherein said acquisition means acquires said associated information related to said group of existing information using said important word selected by said selection means.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Shaffer by the teaching of CAPPI to include weight calculation means for calculating weight of keywords contained in each said group of existing information, selection means for selecting an important word among said key words based upon said weight of key words, wherein said acquisition means acquires said associated information related to said group of existing information using said important word selected by said selection means because it provides accurate accounting and classification of database records and it also provides for efficient method for managing user related information.

Response to Arguments

11. Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christyann RF Pulliam whose telephone number is (571)270-1007. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9 am-6 pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Neveen Abel-Jalil can be reached on 571-272-4074. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/C. R. P./
Examiner, Art Unit 2165
July 14, 2009
/Naveen Abel-Jalil/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2165